Appl. No. 10/034,897
Amdt. dated August 8, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 13, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office Action dated May 13, 2005, in which the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph; 2) rejected claims 1-5, 10-18 and 23-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Thomas (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0107942); and 3) rejected claims 6-9 and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Thomas in view of Hudetz (U.S. Pat. No. 6,199,048). Applicants cancel claims 1-29 and submit new claims 30-46. Based on the arguments below, Applicants believe all pending claims to be in condition for allowance.

Thomas relates to converting sound tones representative of a uniform resource locator (URL) to the URL to permit access to the associated website. Hudetz relates to converting a static image, such as a bar code, to a URL. Claim 30, however, requires "detecting a visual mnemonic associated with a video clip," converting the detected visual mnemonic to a URL, and using the URL to access the website. None of the art of record teaches or even suggests website access by using visual mnemonic associated with a "video clip." For at least this reason, claim 30 and all claims dependent thereon are allowable.

Dependent claims 30 and 31 add additional features not found in the art of record. Claim 30 specifies that the "visual mnemonics are encoded into the video clip at periodic intervals," while claim 31 specifies that the "detecting the visual mnemonic comprises detecting a visual identifier value associated with said visual mnemonic." Neither Thomas nor Hudetz discloses such limitations.

Claim 33 requires "playing a video clip; clicking on a screen location during playback of the video clip; and accessing said website based on said screen location." None of the art of record discloses the use of video clips to access a website as claimed. For at least this reason, claim 33 and all claims dependent thereon are allowable.

Claims 34 and 35 are also patentable for other reasons as well. Claim 34 refers to accessing the website "based on a time during playback of the video clip at which the screen location was clicked" and claim 35 refers to the use of a data file that includes "information that identifies various areas of the screen at various

points in time during the video clip." Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art does not disclose these features.

Claim 36 requires "detecting a mnemonic pertaining to raster lines associated with a non-viewable portion of a computer display." None of art of record has such a teaching. For at least this reason, claim 36 and all claims dependent thereon are allowable.

Claim 38 is a system claim that requires that the processor "detects a visual mnemonic associated with a video clip, causes said visual mnemonic to be converted to a uniform resource locator (URL), and accesses a website using said URL." Applicants do not find the use of video clips as claimed in the art of record. Dependent claims 39 and 40 add additional patent features.

Claim 41 is a system claim that requires that the processor "accesses a website based on a screen location selected by a user during playback of the video clip." Applicants do not find the use of video clips as recited in claim 41 in the art of record. Dependent claims 42 and 43 add additional patent features.

Claim 44 is a system claim that requires that the processor "detects a mnemonic pertaining to raster lines associated with a non-viewable portion of said display and causes said mnemonic to be converted to a uniform resource locator (URL) associated with a website." Applicants do not find reference to mnemonics pertaining to non-viewable portions of a display as claimed in the art of record.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Appl. No. 10/034,897
Amdt. dated August 8, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 13, 2005

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400